REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were examined in the March 6, 2008 final Office Action. A new title is required. Claims 1-10 stand rejected as obvious over FIG. 1, admitted prior art, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,499,388 to *Adam*. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested in view of the remarks which follow.

A. Amended Title

The title has been amended to recite both a module for driving a row in a liquid crystal display and also a system for driving rows of a liquid crystal display. The title is now commensurate with the preamble of all pending claims.

B. Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-10 is Addressed.

The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as over admitted prior art (FIG. 1) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,499,388 to *Adam* is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's rejection is premised upon an identification in *Adam* of an inverter (T21, T22) as having first (line between T11, T12, and T22) and second (U) power terminals. The Examiner's selection of the output node of the inverter as a "power terminal" seems to have been made so the identified switching transistors MT and ZT would be in the correct circuit configuration to reject claims 1 and 6. There is no teaching, however, in *Adam* regarding the switching of node U0, as this node is hardwired to ground. Thus, the primary point of contention is whether the Examiner's characterization of node (U) as a power terminal, and node U0 (which is coupled to ground) as being a second of two power terminals of an inverter is correct.

In response Applicant states that the characterization of node (U) as a "power terminal" is incorrect. Node (U) is in fact not a "power terminal" but rather an output node for providing an "output voltage". *See Adam*, col. 3, lines 8-9.

Rather, the use of 4 terminals of an inverter as the input (or input terminal), out (or output terminal), first power terminal and second power terminal, is well known in the art, for at least the last 30 years. In support of this point, submitted herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement listing U.S. Patent No. 3,959,665, which issued May 25, 1976, and uses this precise terminology at col. 2 lines 39-69 through col. 3, lines 1-37.

Thus, for purposes of identifying the 4 external nodes of an inverter, Applicant's node characterization is correct, conventional and well established. Simply put, a "power terminal" of an inverter is the node at which power is applied to the inverter. There are two such nodes in every inverter. The two other terminals are the input and output terminals. Any person of ordinary skill in the art would concur with this description.

The Examiner's use of node labels as interchangeable is both unconventional and incorrect. Accordingly, the combination of the admitted prior art with *Adam* fails under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as all of the claimed limitations found in claims 1 and 6 are not present in the hypothetical combination of the two references. Claims 1 and 6 are therefore deemed to be allowable over admitted prior art FIG. 1 taken with *Adam*. Remaining claims 2-5 and 7-10 are deemed to be allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

C. Conclusion and Information Disclosure Statement.

Pending claims 1-10 all being in form for allowance, such action is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is kindly asked to telephone the undersigned.

An Information Disclosure Statement is filed herewith, submitting U.S. Patent No. 3,959,665 for consideration by the Examiner. The Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1123 the $180.00 IDS fee and any other fees associated with this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

May 6, 2008

Carol W. Burton, Reg. No. 35,465
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 454-2454
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333